

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.unpto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/594,189	07/13/2007	Klaus Pfizenmaier	040045-0357801	7771
27500 PH I SBURY	7590 05/08/200 WINTHROP SHAW PI		EXAM	MINER
ATTENTION: DOCKETING DEPARTMENT			BUNNER, BRIDGET E	
P.O BOX 1050 McLean, VA 2			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1647	
				1
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/08/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PFIZENMAIER ET AL. 10/594,189

Application No.

Applicant(s)

Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
•	Bridget E. Bunner	1647					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app			 				
Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence a	iaress				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. D. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR. 1.7. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of the poly within the set or extended period for reply with 15 yet statute. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the making earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.70(4p).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this of D (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 Ju	ily 2007.						
a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.							
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims							
4) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)☐ Claim(s) is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-30</u> are subject to restriction and/or €	election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) □ acce	epted or b) ☐ objected to by the I	Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form P	TO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a))-(d) or (f).					
a) All b) Some * c) None of:							
Certified copies of the priority documents							
Certified copies of the priority documents							
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	•	ed in this Nationa	Stage				
application from the International Bureau							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	or the certified copies not receive	a.					
Attachment(s)							
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da						
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (FTO/SE/DE)	5) Notice of Informal P	atent Arr lication					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date .	6) Other:						

Application/Control Number: 10/594,189 Page 2

Art Unit: 1647

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-18, 26-27, drawn to a polypeptide comprising at least components A and at least two components B, wherein each component A is a monomer of a member of the TNF ligand family and each component B is a peptide linker.

Group II, claim(s) 19-23, 26-27, drawn to a nucleic acid coding for a polypeptide comprising at least components A and at least two components B, wherein each component A is a monomer of a member of the TNF ligand family and each component B is a peptide linker; a vector; host cell; and method for preparing a polypeptide.

Group III, claim(s) 24, drawn to a method of using a polypeptide for the preparation of a medication.

Group IV, claim(s) 24, drawn to a method of using a nucleic acid, vector, or host cell for the preparation of a medication.

Group V, claim(s) 25, drawn to a method of using a polypeptide for the treatment of diseases.

Group VI, claim(s) 25, drawn to a method of using a nucleic acid, vector, or host cell for the treatment of diseases.

Group VII, claim(s) 28-30, drawn to a method for extracorporeal manipulation, depletion, and/or removal of soluble suspended components or cellular blood components.

 The inventions listed as Groups I-VII do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: Application/Control Number: 10/594,189

Art Unit: 1647

This PCT rule defines special technical features as technical features that identify a contribution which each of the claimed inventions, considered as a whole, makes over prior art. Claim 1 is anticipated by prior art. Klysner et al. (WO 03/042244; cited on the IDS of 25 September 2006) teach a TNF α polypeptide analog consisting of two or three complete TNF α monomers joined end to end by a peptide linker (page 37, lines 23-29; page 38, lines 10-22). Klysner et al. disclose a control TNF 40 construct that consists of three TNF α monomers directly linker together by two separate glycine linkers (page 39, lines 10-21). Therefore, claim 1 lacks a special technical feature and cannot share one with the other claims.

3. This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species of component C are as follows:

- a. an antibody fragment
- b. a protein or peptide with specificity for a cell surface molecule

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Application/Control Number: 10/594,189 Page 4

Art Unit: 1647

4. The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following manner:

14-18

The following claim(s) are generic: 1-13.

 The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

The special technical feature of (a) is an antibody fragment, which is not shared by the other species. The structure and function of the antibody fragment of (a) is separate and distinct from that of the protein or peptide of species (b).

6. This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species of diseases are as follows:

- c. cancer
- d. infectious
- e. metabolic
- f. inflammatory conditions
- g. hyperproliferative
- h. autoimmune
- i. toxic epidermal necrolysis
- j. multiple sclerosis
- k. Hashimoto's thyroiditis
- 1. GVHD
- m. viral and alcohol-induced hepatitis

n. rejection reactions in liver transplantation

o. diseases based on hyperapoptotic reactions

p. degenerative diseases

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following manner:
 24. 25. 27

The following claim(s) are generic: 24, 25, 26.

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

Each of the species listed as (c)-(p) has a different pathophysiology, patient population, and mode of treatment. Thus, the species of (c)-(p) lack a special technical feature with one another

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

- 9. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).
- 10. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. <u>All</u> claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully

examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bridget E. Bunner whose telephone number is (571) 272-0881. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-4:30 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Manjunath Rao can be reached on (571) 272-0939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

BEB Art Unit 1647 01 May 2009

> /Bridget E Bunner/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1647